

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 8, 9 and 13, leaves claims 11 and 12 unchanged and cancels claim 10. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 8, 9 and 11-13.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to contact Applicants' Attorney, the undersigned, by telephone so as to discuss the outstanding issues of the present application prior to examination.

Claims 8-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,261) and further in view of Grimm (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,868); and claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel, Grimm and further in Cert (the article entitled "CERT'S CC Vendor-Initiated Bulletins 1994-1998"). As indicated above, claim 10 was canceled. Therefore, the above rejection of claim 10 is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection of claim 10 is respectfully requested. The above rejections with respect to the remaining claims 8, 9 and 11-13 is traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 8, 9 and 11-13 are not taught or suggested by Wiegel, Grimm or Cert whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a security

management method and system for supporting security management of managed systems executed in an information system including a plurality of computers connected through a network. According to the present invention, a plurality of security control names and names for obtaining the status/changing configuration of the security control means, information security policy management and inspection supporting device are provided so as to aid in the simplified control and management of security conditions of an information system while conforming to security policy. According to the present invention, the security management method and system inspects whether the managed system is constructed and operated in conformity to the policy established in the design phase of such information system and is able to make changes in configurations of the managed systems when there is a problem by feeding back such information identifying such problems to the security management method and system.

Specifically, the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims provides a security management system and method implemented by the system for supporting security management of a plurality of managed system executed in an information system including a plurality of computers connected to each other through a network.

According to the present invention, the method includes a system design step for designing security specifications to be applied to the information system by extracting an information security policy which corresponds to each managed system constituting an information system designated by a user from a database where a correspondence between

information security policies representing policies of security measures with at least one managed system and the managed system is described, a security install step for executing a plurality of audit programs wherein a process is described audit security status concerning the information security policy which is specified by security specification designed in the security design step for collecting the security status of each managed system designated by the user, and for managing the security status of the managed systems designated by the user, based on the collected information, in consistency of information security policy specified by security specification designed in the security design step and a security management step for executing the installed periodically.

It should be noted that the amendments made to the claims are intended to more clearly describe features of the present invention regarding the process conducted during the management phrase as discussed, for example, in the present application beginning on page 44, line 4 through page 45, line 6.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Wiegel, Grimm or Cert whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Wiegel teaches a graphical network security policy management method and system which supports the establishment of a security policy in the form of a decision tree that is constructed by assembling graphical symbols representing policy actions and policy conditions. As taught by

Wiegel, a user modifies properties of the graphical symbols to create a logical representation of the policy while the logical representation is transformed into a textual script that represents the policy and the script is displayed as the user works with the logical representation. The script is then translated into machine instructions that govern the operation of a network gateway or firewall. However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Wiegel of providing security control means and means for obtaining status of security of different managed systems and to change configuration of the managed systems for controlling a security both during the design phase and during the operation phase as in the present invention. The system taught by Wiegel could support the establishment of security policies.

The system taught by Wiegel is not intended to inspect whether the system operates in conformity to the security policy established during the design as in the present invention such as, for example, during operation of the system as in the present invention.

Further, the system taught by Wiegel does not teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims regarding the details of the management phase. According to the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims during the management step the install step is executed periodically. Such features are clearly not taught or suggested by Wiegel.

Thus, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security design step for designing security specification to be applied to the information system by extracting an information security policy which corresponds to each managed

system constituting an information system designated by a user from a database where a correspondence between information security policies representing policies of security measures with at least one managed system and the managed system is described as recited in the claims.

Further, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security install step for executing a plurality of audit programs wherein a process is described to audit security status concerning the information security policy which is specified by security specifications designed in the security design step, for collecting the security status of each managed system designed by the user, and for changing the security status of the managed systems designated by the user, based on the collected information in consistency of information security policies specified by the securities specification designed in the security design step as recited in the claims.

Still further, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security management step for executing the install step periodically as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Wiegel are also evident in Grimm. Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel and Grimm in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Grimm teaches a process for transparently enforcing protection domains and access control as well auditing operations and software components. Grimm specifically teaches an introspection service for analyzing software component and an interposition service for correcting the software components as its constituents elements. Grimm the same as

Wiegel fails to teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention regarding the providing of security control means and means for obtaining the status and changing the configuration of the security control means in the appropriate manner relative to the security specifications. At no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Grimm of the above described features of the present invention regarding the security design step, the security install step and the security management step as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above both Wiegel and Grimm fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel and Grimm in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 8-11 and 13 as being unpatentable over Wiegel in view of Grimm is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Wiegel and Grimm are also not supplied by Cert. Cert is merely relied upon by the Examiner for an alleged teaching of security information published by a security information organization including Cert. Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Cert of the above described features of the present invention regarding the security specification design step, the security install step and the security management step as recited in the claims.

Thus, Cert suffers from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims as Wiegel and Grimm.

Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel, Grimm and Cert in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action does not render obvious the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable over Wiegel, Grimm and Cert is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 8, 9 and 11-13.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 8, 9 and 11-13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 8, 9 and 11-13 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (566.39530VX1).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120